



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,360	03/15/2007	Yee Kiat See	PA040025	9691
7590 Joseph S Tripoli Patent Operations Thomson Licensing Inc P O Box 5312 Princeton, NJ 08543-5312			EXAMINER SIMONETTI, NICHOLAS J	
			ART UNIT 2187	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/19/2011	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/561,360

Applicant(s)

SEE ET AL.

Examiner

NICHOLAS SIMONETTI

Art Unit

2187

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the current status" in various locations throughout, the Examiner believes these should be --the current loading status-- as in the now amended language. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garney (US Patent 5412798) in view of Yamauchi et al. (US Patent 5661823).

With regard to claim 1, Garney teaches a method for indicating the current loading status of a removable media device provided for being loaded with at least one

removable medium associated with a characteristic feature (Column 6 Line 56: "a method and circuitry for dynamically configuring device drivers of removable system resources"), and the removable media device being connectable to a device for reading and/or writing AV storage media, comprising:

detecting connection or disconnection of the removable media device (Column 13 Line 57: "Card event service routine 1101 is activated when a hardware event is detected by the computer system upon the insertion or removal of a feature card in any socket provided by the computer system");

updating the current status in case a connection or disconnection is detected (Figure 9: Step 1111 indicating card disconnection leading to Step 1127 involving changing the current status of the card. Also, Figure 10: Card Insertion Processing 800 following the detection of a card insertion event, Step 1107/1108 in Figure 9, involving the changing the status of the card in Step B as shown in Figure 11.);

keeping the current status of the removable media device if the type of user input is not related to the removable media device (Column 14 Line 35: "if the hardware event causing the activation of card event service routine 1101, is neither a card insertion event nor a card removal event, processing path 1113 is taken to processing block 1117 where the unidentified event is recorded. Processing then terminates at bubble 1131");

checking whether a characteristic feature of the at least one removable medium has changed (See Figure 10: Card Insertion Processing. Column 14 Line 58: "Decision block 809 tests whether or not the device driver stub for the newly installed card still

resides in the computer system RAM based on the device driver stub unique identification");

keeping the current status if the characteristic feature of the at least one removable medium has not changed (Column 14 Line 61: "If the stub still resides there, then the device driver stub executable code does not need to be loaded again"); and

updating the current status if the characteristic feature of the removable medium has changed (Column 14 Line 65: "If the stub is not still resident, processing path 812 is taken". See Figure 10: Path 812 leading to Bubble 'B' and see also Figure 11: Bubble 'B' leading to Block 919 "Set command 680 to initialize. Set a card Insertion flag in stub data to indicate that a card is inserted in to a socket and accessible to computer system").

With further regard to claim 1, Garney teaches the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Garney does not teach the user input and subsequent operations as described in claim 1. Yamauchi teaches

checking a type of user input upon occurrence of user input, wherein the user input is not generated by the connection or disconnection of the removable media device (Column 50 Line 36: "The editing machine 600 is designed to receive operations of the exclusive keyboard 602a and remote control operation part 602i, display the menu of functions on the display part 602h of the exclusive keyboard 602a, and select a desired function from this menu". Column 52 Line 3: "in FIG. 90, when the retrieval is selected (step S168) on the main menu, the CPU part 625 changes the screen of

display 1 to V2, the menu level to '1' and the menu mode name to 'retrieval' so as to specify the retrieval destination in step S169, and all input sources connected to the editing machine 600 (memory cards 1, 2, HDD, DDD) are displayed");

checking whether the at least one removable medium has changed, if the type of user input is related to the removable media device (Column 44 Line 67: "Pre-processing ... necessary for input and output of data with the memory card 400 and card type connector 504 ... [including] confirmation of ... card type connector 504 ... and selection of bus to be connected with inside are automatically set or confirmed by the CPU before execution of data transfer or after completion of transfer." Further to emphasize that such preprocessing is related to user input, Figure 90 showing 'Retrieval', i.e. data transfer, processing as it relates to Figure 83A showing the CPU operation processing in a data transfer. Still Further to emphasize, Column 48 Line 26: "FIG. 83A ... showing the operation processing of the CPU in data transfer. When started (step S143) by receiving data transfer request, the CPU judges, in step S144, what are the transfer source and transfer destination devices, and whether the transfer format is through, compression or expansion, and in step S145, pre-processing such as settings necessary for the transfer source and transfer destination device is executed, and the transfer source and transfer destination devices are connected to the data bus and control bus in step S146.");

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method as disclosed by

Garney with the type of user input and subsequent operations as taught by Yamauchi such that it "initializes necessary devices" (Yamauchi Column 50 Line 52).

With regard to claim 2, Garney in view of Yamauchi teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Garney further teaches wherein the characteristic feature is an identifier of the at least one removable medium (Column 14 Line 58: "Decision block 809 tests whether or not the device driver stub for the newly installed card still resides in the computer system RAM based on the device driver stub unique identification". See also Figure 4: Device driver stub unique identification 407).

With regard to claim 3, Garney in view of Yamauchi teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Yamauchi further teaches wherein user input types related to the removable media device are one or more of input command to enter removable media device sub-menu (Column 50 Line 36: "The editing machine 600 is designed to receive operations of the exclusive keyboard 602a and remote control operation part 602i, display the menu of functions on the display part 602h of the exclusive keyboard 602a, and select a desired function from this menu". Column 50 Line 50: "the CPU part 625 judges the type and quantity of devices connected to the editing machine 600 in step S161, and reduces possible functions on the basis of the result of judgment, and initializes necessary devices. Meanwhile, the result of judgment of connected devices is ... used in selection of menu". Column 51 Line 29: "when the display function is selected on the main menu, the screen of display 1 becomes as shown in FIG. 88"),

input command to navigate within a removable media device sub-menu (Column 51 Line 44: "in the menu level 1, the display output can be specified. This display output is available in four types, menu, standard, processing, and division"), input command to access a removable medium (Column 51 Line 37: "when the memory card 1 is specified, for example, the screen of display 1 changes to level 2, menu mode name 'specification' as shown in FIG. 89"), and input command that generally is preceding an access to a removable medium (Column 52 Line 3: "in FIG. 90, when the retrieval is selected (step S168) on the main menu, the CPU part 625 changes the screen of display 1 to V2, the menu level to '1' and the menu mode name to 'retrieval' so as to specify the retrieval destination in step S169, and all input sources connected to the editing machine 600 (memory cards 1, 2, HDD, DDD) are displayed").

With regard to claim 5, Garney in view of Yamauchi teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Garney further teaches wherein identifiers of all removable media of a multiscard reader type media device are checked (Column 13 Line 21: "If any feature cards are currently installed in any of the available sockets of the computer system, the identity or address of the installed cards is obtained in processing block 711". See Figure 7: Block 711).

With regard to claim 6, Garney in view of Yamauchi teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Garney further teaches wherein, for a multiscard reader type media device the file structure of all inserted removable media is read and

assembled to a single file structure (Column 21 Line 7: "memory area 1700 is depicted as it would appear after Card B, having device driver DD-B, was inserted into slot 2 of the computer system while card A remained inserted in Slot 1. There are two slots in the computer system, therefore device driver stub memory has been allocated to be the size of the two largest feature card device driver stubs. Therefore, in this example, memory area 1700 has been allocated to be five memory units in size. In this way, memory area 1700 can contain DD-A and DD-B simultaneously". See Figure 17a-f).

With regard to claim 8, Garney teaches an apparatus for reading and/or writing AV storage media comprising:

a removable medium having a characteristic feature (Column 9 Line 39: "Device driver stub unique identification 407 is a unique value that identifies the device driver stub and distinguishes the device driver stub from all other device driver stubs."), the removable media device associated with a current status (Column 12 Line 26: "Card insertion flag 672 is used to retain an indication of whether the card associated with the device driver stub is inserted or removed." Column 13 Line 23: "If any feature cards are currently installed in any of the available sockets of the computer system, the identity or address of the installed cards is obtained in processing block 711.");

a user input device that receives user input (Figure 1: Removable Feature Card Interface 108 and/or Input Device 104); and

a controller that

detects connection or disconnection of the removable media device (Column 13 Line 57: "Card event service routine 1101 is activated when a hardware event is detected by the computer system upon the insertion or removal of a feature card in any socket provided by the computer system");

updates the current status in case a connection or disconnection is detected (Figure 9: Step 1111 indicating card disconnection leading to Step 1127 involving changing the current status of the card. Also, Figure 10: Card Insertion Processing 800 following the detection of a card insertion event, Step 1107/1108 in Figure 9, involving the changing the status of the card in Step B as shown in Figure 11.);

checks for a change in the characteristic feature of the removable medium (See Figure 10: Card Insertion Processing. Column 14 Line 58: "Decision block 809 tests whether or not the device driver stub for the newly installed card still resides in the computer system RAM based on the device driver stub unique identification"), and

updates the current status when the characteristic feature of the removable medium is changed (Column 14 Line 65: "If the stub is not still resident, processing path 812 is taken". See Figure 10: Path 812 leading to Bubble 'B' and see also Figure 11: Bubble 'B' leading to Block 919 "Set command 680 to initialize. Set a card Insertion flag in stub data to indicate that a card is inserted in to a socket and accessible to computer system").

With further regard to claim 8, Garney teaches the limitations of claim 8 as described above. Garney does not teach the connector and user input causing subsequent operations as described in claim 8. Yamauchi teaches

a connector for a removable media device having at least one removable medium (Figure 14: Electronic Still Camera having external connector 123 and card insertion connector/port 206. As described in Column 11 Line 8: "an insertion part 206 of memory card 400", and Column 12 Line 66: "a connector part 123 (protected by a lid body not shown in the drawing when not in use) is disposed at one side");

detects a user input related to the removable media device upon the occurrence of the user input, wherein the user input is not generated by the connection or disconnection of the removable media device (Column 50 Line 36: "The editing machine 600 is designed to receive operations of the exclusive keyboard 602a and remote control operation part 602i, display the menu of functions on the display part 602h of the exclusive keyboard 602a, and select a desired function from this menu". Column 52 Line 3: "in FIG. 90, when the retrieval is selected (step S168) on the main menu, the CPU part 625 changes the screen of display 1 to V2, the menu level to '1' and the menu mode name to 'retrieval' so as to specify the retrieval destination in step S169, and all input sources connected to the editing machine 600 (memory cards 1, 2, HDD, DDD) are displayed"); and

checks for a change of the removable medium (Column 44 Line 67: "Pre-processing ... necessary for input and output of data with the memory card 400 and card type connector 504 ... [including] confirmation of ... card type connector 504 ...

and selection of bus to be connected with inside are automatically set or confirmed by the CPU before execution of data transfer or after completion of transfer." Further to emphasize that such preprocessing is related to user input, Figure 90 showing 'Retrieval', i.e. data transfer, processing as it relates to Figure 83A showing the CPU operation processing in a data transfer. Still Further to emphasize, Column 48 Line 26: "FIG. 83A ... showing the operation processing of the CPU in data transfer. When started (step S143) by receiving data transfer request, the CPU judges, in step S144, what are the transfer source and transfer destination devices, and whether the transfer format is through, compression or expansion, and in step S145, pre-processing such as settings necessary for the transfer source and transfer destination device is executed, and the transfer source and transfer destination devices are connected to the data bus and control bus in step S146.");

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the apparatus as disclosed by Garney with the connector and user input which causes subsequent operations as taught by Yamauchi in order to "to take out the digital image data ... to [the] outside" (Yamaguchi Column 13 Line 1) such that it "initializes necessary devices" (Yamauchi Column 50 Line 52).

With regard to claim 9, Garney in view of Yamauchi teaches all the limitations of claim 8 as described above. Garney further teaches wherein the characteristic feature is an identifier of the removable medium (Column 9 Line 39: "Device driver stub unique

identification 407 is a unique value that identifies the device driver stub and distinguishes the device driver stub from all other device driver stubs.”).

With regard to claim 10, Garney in view of Yamauchi teaches all the limitations of claim 8 as described above. Yamauchi further teaches wherein the user input includes an input command to enter a removable media device's sub-menu (Column 50 Line 36: “The editing machine 600 is designed to receive operations of the exclusive keyboard 602a and remote control operation part 602i, display the menu of functions on the display part 602h of the exclusive keyboard 602a, and select a desired function from this menu”. Column 50 Line 50: “the CPU part 625 judges the type and quantity of devices connected to the editing machine 600 in step S161, and reduces possible functions on the basis of the result of judgment, and initializes necessary devices. Meanwhile, the result of judgment of connected devices is ... used in selection of menu”. Column 51 Line 29: “when the display function is selected on the main menu, the screen of display 1 becomes as shown in FIG. 88”), an input command to navigate within a removable media device's sub-menu (Column 51 Line 44: “in the menu level 1, the display output can be specified. This display output is available in four types, menu, standard, processing, and division”), an input command to access a removable medium (Column 51 Line 37: “when the memory card 1 is specified, for example, the screen of display 1 changes to level 2, menu mode name ‘specification’ as shown in FIG. 89”), an input command that precedes access to a removable medium (Column 52 Line 3: “in FIG. 90, when the retrieval is selected (step S168) on the main menu, the CPU part 625

changes the screen of display 1 to V2, the menu level to '1' and the menu mode name to 'retrieval' so as to specify the retrieval destination in step S169, and all input sources connected to the editing machine 600 (memory cards 1, 2, HDD, DDD) are displayed").

With regard to claim 12, Garney in view of Yamauchi teaches all the limitations of claim 8 as described above. Garney further teaches wherein the removable media device is a multiscard removable media device (Figure 2: Removable Media Device 201 having Removable Media 211 and 213); and wherein the controller checks identifiers of all removable media of the multiscard removable media device (Column 13 Line 23: "If any feature cards are currently installed in any of the available sockets of the computer system, the identity or address of the installed cards is obtained in processing block 711.").

With regard to claim 13, Garney in view of Yamauchi teaches all the limitations of claim 8 as described above. Garney further teaches wherein the removable media device is a multiscard removable media device (Figure 2: Removable Media Device 201 having Removable Media 211 and 213); and wherein the controller reads file structures of all inserted removable media and assembles them into a single file structure (Column 9 Line 6: "Device driver information block header 305, comprises information used for linking the device driver with computer system processing logic." Column 9 Line 16: "the device driver stub code image 307 is read from card memory area 303 and transferred into an area of computer system memory 102 set aside for device driver stubs. The

device driver stub code is then executed by the processor of the computer system from computer system random access memory.” Column 10 Line 2: “Knowing the location and size of the code and data areas for the device driver stub, operating system logic within the computer system can transfer the device driver stub code and data areas from the feature card into computer system random access memory.”).

Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garney (US Patent 5412798) in view of Yamauchi et al. (US Patent 5661823), and further in view of Edmondson (US Patent 3619585).

With regard to claim 4, Garney in view of Yamauchi teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Garney in view of Yamauchi does not teach the repeated read attempts in response to an error as described in claim 4. Edmondson teaches wherein checking whether a characteristic feature of the at least one removable medium has changed is performed repeatedly in case an error status has been detected (Abstract: “If an error is detected while reading data from a particular location in a memory, that same location is automatically reread a given number of times. If an error does not occur during the reread cycles, the program continues and the succeeding memory locations are read in normal sequence”). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method as disclosed by Garney in view of Yamauchi with the repeated read attempts in response to an error as taught by Edmondson since

"manually reinterrogating the machine's ROM is uneconomical" and "it is more desirable to have the reinterrogation performed automatically" (Edmondson Column 1 Line 24).

With regard to claim 11, Garney in view of Yamauchi teaches all the limitations of claim 8 as described above. Garney in view of Yamauchi does not teach the repeated read attempts in response to an error as described in claim 11. Edmondson teaches wherein the controller checks whether a characteristic feature of the removable medium has been changed is repeated in case an error status has been detected (Abstract: "If an error is detected while reading data from a particular location in a memory, that same location is automatically reread a given number of times. If an error does not occur during the reread cycles, the program continues and the succeeding memory locations are read in normal sequence"). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the apparatus as disclosed by Garney in view of Yamauchi with the repeated read attempts in response to an error as taught by Edmondson since "manually reinterrogating the machine's ROM is uneconomical" and "it is more desirable to have the reinterrogation performed automatically" (Edmondson Column 1 Line 24).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Pages 5-8, filed 2/22/11, with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's arguments that the features of Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are not taught by the cited prior art, Examiner respectfully disagrees and refers applicant to the rejection of the instant claims as discussed supra with respect to the same.

With respect to Applicant's argument regarding Claim 1 that Gamey does not teach the user input as described, Examiner respectfully disagrees but for purposes of expediting prosecution has modified the rejection of Claim 1 to more clearly show how Gamey in view of Yamaguchi anticipates this limitation. The Examiner now refers the applicant to the newly made rejection above regarding this limitation.

With respect to Applicant's further argument, Page 6 Paragraph 3 of Applicant's remarks, regarding Claim 1 that Yamauchi does not teach, "user input *during operation* of a device ... [which] relates to a removable media unit" (emphasis added), Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner would like to note that the method of Yamauchi does carry out user input operations related to a memory card during operation of a device. The method as described by Yamauchi simply allows for the retrieval of data from a memory card of an electronic camera through the use of an editing machine, as the specification describes that the "editing machine 600 is designed to receive operations of the exclusive keyboard 602a ... display the menu of functions on the display ... and select a desired function from this menu" (Yamauchi Column 50 Line 36) and subsequently "when the retrieval is selected (step S168) on the main menu, the CPU part 625

changes the screen of display ... to specify the retrieval destination in step S169, and all input sources connected to the editing machine 600 (memory cards 1, 2, HDD, DDD) are displayed" (Yamauchi Column 52 Line 3), as discussed supra. In fact, the instant invention must operate in a similar manner as the method of Yamauchi if the user is have input related to operations regarding a removable media unit.

Accordingly, Examiner has mapped the retrieval method of Yamauchi, as applied supra, to the originally disclosed user input which is related to a removable media device as claimed and shown in Figure 10 of the instant application.

The instant disclosure as originally filed does not appear to enable one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make and/or use an invention that operates differently than the originally disclosed "checking a type of user input [related to a removable media device] upon occurrence of user input"; as disclosed in Figure 10 and the related text of the instant specification.

Accordingly, Examiner has reasonably interpreted "user input [related to a removable media device]" to be the user specified retrieval method which Yamauchi discloses.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICHOLAS SIMONETTI whose telephone number is (571)270-7702. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30AM-5PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Ellis can be reached on (571)272-4205. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. S./
Nicholas Simonetti
Examiner, Art Unit 2187
April 5, 2011

/Brian R. Peugh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2187
April 7, 2011